

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JANET MONGE, <div style="text-align: center;"><i>Plaintiff</i></div> v. UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA <i>et al.</i> , <div style="text-align: center;"><i>Defendants</i></div>	: : : : : : : :	CIVIL ACTION No. 22-2942
---	--------------------------------------	---


ORDER

And now this 2nd day of February, 2023, upon consideration of Hyperallergic Media, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Dr. Janet Monge's Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 28), Dr. Monge's Response in Opposition to Hyperallergic's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 71), Hyperallergic's Reply in Further Support of Its Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 86), Hyperallergic's Supplemental Response in Further Support of Its Motion to Dismiss Dr. Monge's Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 101), and Dr. Monge's Supplemental Memorandum in Support of Her Response to the Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (Doc. No. 102), it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows for the reasons set forth in the accompanying memorandum:

1. Hyperallergic's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 28) is **GRANTED WITH PREJUDICE** as to the defamation and false light causes of action alleged in Dr. Monge's amended complaint.

2. Hyperallergic's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 28) is **GRANTED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** as to the defamation by implication and civil aiding and abetting causes of action alleged in Dr. Monge's amended complaint.

BY THE COURT:



GENE E.K. PRATTER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE